Journal of Marketing Research
Annotated Subject Index and Author/Title Index
Volume XXIV, 1987

ANNOTATED SUBJECT INDEX 463
Advertising and Media Research 463
Brand Choice 464
Buyer Behavior 464
Channels of Distribution 465
Econometric Models 465
Forecasting 466
Information Processing 466
Marketing Decision Making 466
Measurement 466
New Product Research 467
Regression and Other Statistical Techniques 467
Research Design 468
Salesforce Research 468
Sampling and Survey Methods 468
Scaling Methods 468
Segmentation Research 469
Services Marketing 469
Strategy and Planning 469
AUTHOR/TITLE INDEX 469
BOOKS AND SOFTWARE REVIEWED 472

ADVERTISING AND MEDIA RESEARCH

Advertising Quality in Sales Response Models, STEPHEN J. ARNOLD, TAE H. OUM, BONHUMIR PAZDERKA, and DOUGLAS W. SNETSINGER, February, 106–113.

Hedonic price theory is adapted to advertising. A quality-adjusted advertising spending function is embedded in a sales response model and the parameters of both equations are estimated in one step. The procedure provides an alternative to the judgmental aggregation of attributes of advertising quality into a single value. The results permit comparison of the sales effects of variations in advertising spending with the effects of variations in copy quality, and permit computation of an advertising figure that accounts for both copy quality and actual spending. A pilot study illustrates the procedure.

Associative Positioning Strategies Through Comparative Advertising: Attribute Versus Overall Similarity Approaches, CORNELIA DRÖGE and RENÉ Y. DARMON, November, 377–388.

The authors compare the relative effectiveness of comparative/noncomparative and product-based/non-product-based advertising in the implementation of an associative strategy for cognitive brand positioning. Two metaconstructs, cognitive accuracy and cognitive clarity, are defined, each within an attitude model and a probabilistic multidimensional scaling model. The results from these very different methodological and conceptual approaches indicate that directly comparative advertisements are superior in engendering *overall* brand positioning, whereas only product-based directly comparative ads are superior in engendering brand positioning at the attribute level, and only in terms of positioning clarity.

Encoding and Media Effects on Consumer Learning Deficiencies in the Elderly, CATHERINE A. COLE and MICHAEL J. HOUSTON, February, 55–63.

Alternative cognitive explanations of memory deficiencies in the elderly suggest certain conditions in which elderly might be expected to learn less than younger adults in a consumer information processing context. The authors investigated these conditions using the levels-of-processing framework for the study of memory. The results indicate greater difficulties on the part of the elderly in deeply processing information from print media and in realizing the learning benefits of television. These findings suggest that marketers face unique problems in reaching this increasingly attractive market segment.

Picture-Word Consistency and the Elaborative Processing of Advertisements, MICHAEL J. HOUSTON, TERRY L. CHILDERS, and SUSAN E. HECKLER, November, 359–369.

Many advertisers believe the pictorial and verbal components of an ad should convey the same meaning. Based on theoretical and empirical evidence from a variety of areas, three experiments were conducted that show superior recall for ads in which the picture and copy convey discrepant information about product attributes when the picture and brand name are linked interactively. An elaborative processing explanation for the effect is supported by the finding that this superiority diminishes if consumers have less opportunity to process the ad and form associative linkages in memory.

Source Magnification: The Role of Multiple Sources in the Processing of Advertising Appeals, DAVID J. MOORE and RICHARD REARDON, November, 412–417.

Using the information processing approach adopted by Harkins and Petty, the authors find the polarization of thoughts and attitudes in response to strong versus weak arguments to be greater when

Journal of Marketing Research
Vol. XXIV (November 1987), 463–472

subjects are exposed to multiple message sources rather than to a single source.

Two-Sided Versus One-Sided Appeals: A Cognitive Perspective on Argumentation, Source Derogation, and the Effect of Disconfirming Trial on Belief Change, MICHAEL A. KAMINS and HENRY ASSAEL, February, 29–39.

The authors consider the effects of exposure to various advertising appeal types (differing in sidedness) on cognitive response and belief change in the context of inoculation and correspondence theory. In one experiment, subjects were exposed to either a one-sided, two-sided refutational, or two-sided nonrefutational appeal and the degree of cognitive activity incurred was measured. Results are partially supportive of both inoculation and correspondence theory, as two-sided appeals produced significantly less counterargumentation and source derogation than the one-sided appeal. In addition, the refutational appeal led to significantly more support argumentation than the one-sided appeal. However, exposure to either two-sided appeal did not differentially affect cognitions. In a second experiment, a disconfirming product trial experience was introduced as an "attack" condition to observe the effects on belief change given exposure to one of the advertising appeals used before. For all attributes, exposure to the one-sided appeal resulted in the greatest degree of belief change. Dominance for the predictions of inoculation over those of correspondence theory is not evident as belief change did not differ significantly between subjects exposed to either two-sided appeal. Finally, a measure of the change in purchase intent has only (nonsignificant) directional support.

BRAND CHOICE

A Simultaneous Approach to Market Segmentation and Market Structuring, RAJIV GROVER and V. SRINIVASAN, May, 139–153.
See "Segmentation Research"

Constructing MDS Joint Spaces from Binary Choice Data: A Multidimensional Unfolding Threshold Model for Marketing Research, WAYNE S. DeSARBO and DONNA L. HOFFMAN, February, 40–54.
See "Econometric Models"

Empirical Evidence Supporting the Use of Multiple Choice Models in Analyzing a Population, DENNIS H. GENSCH, May, 197–207.
See "Segmentation Research"

Estimating Brand Positioning Maps Using Supermarket Scanning Data, STEVEN M. SHUGAN, February, 1–18.

Hauser and Shugan's DEFENDER model is estimated with data obtained from supermarket scanning devices. As a result of that estimation, per dollar multidimensional brand maps are obtained from aggregate sales and price time series data. The estimation procedure employs least squares regression analysis. The maps enable a researcher or brand manager to (1) derive a map from observed choice behavior, (2) study the direct effect of both a brand's price and a brand's position on that brand's sales, (3) obtain statistical measures of accuracy for the estimated brand coordinates, and (4) integrate the traditional cross-price elasticity interpretation of substitutability with perceptual mapping. Actual maps are estimated for three product categories (toothpaste, mouthwash, and dishwashing liquid). Preliminary findings are presented. For example, brands produced by the same manufacturer are often in proximity.

Identifying the Generics-Prone Consumer: A Meta-Analysis, DAVID M. SZYMANSKI and PAUL S. BUSCH, November, 425–431.

The authors conducted a meta-analysis of the generics literature. The meta-analysis reveals the strongest predictors of a proneness to buy generic products are consumer perceptions of generics' quality and price and consumers' overall evaluation of generic products. Demographic and psychographic variables and consumer shopping behaviors are related only weakly to consumers' proneness to buy generics.

The Effects of a Direct Mail Coupon on Brand Choice Behavior, KAPIL BAWA and ROBERT W. SHOEMAKER, November, 370–376.

The authors examine the effects of a manufacturer coupon on brand choice behavior. The level of coupon redemption and changes in brand choice behavior after redemption are examined as a function of the household's prior probability of purchasing the promoted brand, likelihood of buying a favorite competitive brand, and coupon face value. A model of the coupon redemption decision is developed to predict response to the coupon promotion by different consumer segments. Predictions from the model are tested by using scanner panel data from a field experiment on coupon face values. Coupon redemption rates are found to be much higher among households that have purchased the brand on a regular basis in the past. The results also suggest that most consumers revert to their precoupon choice behavior immediately after their redemption purchase. These and other findings have important implications for the profitability of coupon promotions.

BUYER BEHAVIOR

A Stochastic First Purchase Diffusion Model: A Counting Process Approach, FRED BÖKER, February, 64–73.
See "New Product Research."

Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE, TERENCE A. SHIMP and SUBHASH SHARMA, August, 280–289.

The concept of consumer ethnocentrism is introduced and a corresponding measure, the CETSCALE, is formulated and validated. Four separate studies provide support for the CETSCALE's reliability and convergent and discriminant validity. A series of nomological validity tests show consumer ethnocentrism to be moderately predictive of theoretically related constructs.

Defensive Marketing Strategy by Customer Complaint Management: A Theoretical Perspective, CLAES FORNELL and BIRGER WERNERFELT, November, 337–346.
See "Strategy and Planning"

Effects of Relationship Marketing on Satisfaction, Retention, and Prices in the Life Insurance Industry, LAWRENCE A. CROSBY and NANCY STEPHENS, November, 404–411.

Complex, highly intangible services such as life insurance consist largely of credence properties. Insurance providers engage in relationship-building activities that emphasize buyer-seller interaction and communication. Economists contend consumers are prone to make quality generalizations based on the strength of these relationships, perhaps to the detriment of price competition. The authors report contrary results suggesting that, though relationship marketing adds value to the service package, it is not a substitute for having a strong, up-to-date core service.

Expectations and Norms in Models of Consumer Satisfaction, ERNEST R. CADOTTE, ROBERT B. WOODRUFF, and ROGER L. JENKINS, August, 305–315.

Disconfirmation models of customer satisfaction employing three alternative standards of performance were compared by using causal modeling. Pre- and post-measures were obtained from subjects in three different use situations. The disconfirmation paradigm is sup-

ported. The analysis suggests that best brand norm and product norm are additional standards used for evaluating focal brand performance.

Identifying the Generics-Prone Consumer: A Meta-Analysis, DAVID M. SZYMANSKI and PAUL S. BUSCH, November, 425–431.
See "Brand Choice"

Product/Consumption-Based Affective Responses and Postpurchase Processes, ROBERT A. WESTBROOK, August, 258–270.
The author examines consumer affective responses to product/consumption experiences and their relationship to selected aspects of postpurchase processes. In separate field studies of automobile owners and CATV subscribers, subjects reported the nature and frequency of emotional experiences in connection with product ownership and usage. Analysis confirms hypotheses about the existence of independent dimensions of positive and negative affect. Both dimensions of affective response are found directly related to the favorability of consumer satisfaction judgments, extent of seller-directed complaint behavior, and extent of word-of-mouth transmission.

The Effects of a Direct Mail Coupon on Brand Choice Behavior, KAPIL BAWA and ROBERT W. SHOEMAKER, November, 370–376.
See "Brand Choice"

Two-Sided Versus One-Sided Appeals: A Cognitive Perspective on Argumentation, Source Derogation, and the Effect of Disconfirming Trial on Belief Change, MICHAEL A. KAMINS and HENRY ASSAEL, February, 29–39.
See "Advertising and Media Research"

CHANNELS OF DISTRIBUTION

Commentary on Howell's Observations, JOHN F. GASKI, February, 127–129.
The author offers some reflections on Howell's critique. He provides clarifications and explanations of the Gaski (1986) article including, in one instance, information not originally reported. Some, but not all, of Howell's criticisms are disputed, some are elaborated upon, and corollary questions are raised about his note in its own right.

Covariance Structure Modeling and Measurement Issues: A Note on "Interrelations Among a Channel Entity's Power Sources," ROY D. HOWELL, February, 119–126.
The author examines the measurement and modeling procedures employed by Gaski in a study of the relationships among a channel entity's power sources. A correct specification of the measurement model provides different parameter estimates and conclusions about the fit of the models. A respecification also overcomes Gaski's problems with model identification and provides information not available in the original analysis.

Inducing Franchisees to Relinquish Control: An Attribution Analysis, PUNAN ANAND, May, 215–221.
The author identifies an effective method to induce franchisees to relinquish control in decision making. Attribution theory principles are introduced to describe the process by which franchisees make attributions for their performance. The findings suggest that a franchisee's choice of attributions is dependent on the behavior of other franchisees and their performance. The analysis serves as a basis for predicting when franchisees are likely to relinquish control.

Output Sector Munificence Effects on the Internal Political Economy of Marketing Channels, F. ROBERT DWYER and SEJO OH, November, 347–358.
Like any system, a marketing channel will thrive only to the extent it can secure critical resources from the environment. Using a resource dependence perspective, the authors hypothesize that a weaker member's access to relatively munificent output markets can mitigate a power advantage held by the channel partner that otherwise is used to bureaucratize the channel and endanger the quality of the channel relationship. The authors use a structural equation model to analyze data from dealer informants in the auto industry. The results suggest munificence affects the internal workings of the channel.

Resource Allocation Behavior in Conventional Channels, ERIN ANDERSON, LEONARD M. LODISH, and BARTON A. WEITZ, February, 85–97.
This exploratory study assesses the impact of variables associated with a financial portfolio model (marginal returns, growth, synergy, and uncertainty) and characteristics of the channel relationship (power, organizational climate, and communications) on the selling time allocated by 71 independent sales agencies to the principals they represent. The results indicate that the time allocated to principals is consistent with a normative microeconomic model; however, aspects of the channel relationship, particularly communications, participation, and feedback, also influence resource allocations.

ECONOMETRIC MODELS

Advertising Quality in Sales Response Models, STEPHEN J. ARNOLD, TAE H. OUM, BONHUMIR PAZDERKA, and DOUGLAS W. SNETSINGER, February, 106–113.
See "Advertising and Media Research"

Constructing MDS Joint Spaces from Binary Choice Data: A Multidimensional Unfolding Threshold Model for Marketing Research, WAYNE S. DeSARBO and DONNA L. HOFFMAN, February, 40–54.
The authors present a new multidimensional unfolding methodology that can analyze various types of individual choice data. The model represents choice data, defined by dichotomous variables that indicate whether a particular brand was chosen or not, in terms of a joint space of consumers and brands. Explicit treatment of marketing and subject background variables is allowed through optional model reparameterizations of consumers and brands. Together with the joint space representation of both consumers and brands, these optional reparameterizations can provide information on appropriate market segmentation bases and respective product positioning strategies. The authors apply this spatial choice model to data on consumer (intended) choices for 12 residential communications devices and demonstrate how the results can be used for optimal positioning decisions.

Cross-Validation for Prediction, BRUCE COOIL, RUSSELL S. WINER, and DAVID L. RADOS, August, 271–279.
See "Regression and Other Statistical Techniques"

Estimation and Use of Standard Errors of Latent Class Model Parameters, RAJIV GROVER, August, 298–304.
See "Regression and Other Statistical Techniques"

Expectations and Norms in Models of Consumer Satisfaction, ERNEST R. CADOTTE, ROBERT B. WOODRUFF, and ROGER L. JENKINS, August, 305–314.
See "Buyer Behavior"

Modeling Marketing Interactions with Application to Salesforce Effectiveness, HUBERT GATIGNON and DOMINIQUE M. HANSSENS, August, 247–257.

The authors propose that a general class of market response models with marketing parameter equations be used for the study of marketing interactions. They inventory alternative model specifications of marketing mix interactions, along with the estimation procedures, and compare two that are relevant in an application to the determinants of U.S. Navy salesforce effectiveness. The authors also illustrate the importance of modeling interactions as a basis for making inferences about marketing mix resource allocation.

On the Assessment of Unidimensional Measurement: Internal and External Consistency, and Overall Consistency Criteria, JAMES C. ANDERSON, DAVID W. GERBING, and JOHN E. HUNTER, November, 432–437.

See "Measurement"

Some Further Remarks on Measurement-Structure Interaction and the Unidimensionality of Constructs, AJITH KUMAR and WILLIAM R. DILLON, November, 438–444.

See "Measurement"

Territory Sales Response Models: Stability Over Time, ADRIAN B. RYANS and CHARLES B. WEINBERG, May, 229–233.

See "Salesforce Research"

The Interaction of Measurement and Structure in Simultaneous Equation Models with Unobservable Variables, AJITH KUMAR and WILLIAM R. DILLON, February, 98–105.

See "Measurement"

FORECASTING

Heuristics and Biases in the Intuitive Projection of Retail Sales, ANTHONY D. COX and JOHN D. SUMMERS, August, 290–297.

Retail merchandise buyers are shown to exhibit a nonregressive bias when making sales projections. A quantitative model based on the principle of statistical regression is found to outperform the judgmental sales predictions of experienced buyers. Implications for the appropriate roles of intuitive and model-based decision making in retail merchandise buying are discussed.

INFORMATION PROCESSING

A Comparison of Factors Affecting Use of Marketing Information in Consumer and Industrial Firms, ROHIT DESHPANDE and GERALD ZALTMAN, February, 114–118.

Despite recent attention to organizational issues in the management of advertising, sales, new product development, and channels, there has been little empirical study of the management of the marketing research function. The study reported complements earlier work on the use of marketing information in consumer goods businesses by examining factors seen as affecting the use of marketing information in industrial firms.

Encoding and Media Effects on Consumer Learning Deficiencies in the Elderly, CATHERINE A COLE and MICHAEL J. HOUSTON, February, 55–63.

See "Advertising and Media Research"

Evaluation and Use of Marketing Research by Decision Makers: A Behavioral Simulation, HANJOON LEE, FRANK ACITO, and RALPH L. DAY, May, 187–196.

A behavioral simulation in a laboratory setting was used to investigate decision makers' evaluation and use of marketing research results. Propositions about the persistence of the decision makers' prior beliefs under various research design conditions (qualitative interview or quantitative survey, convenience or probability sampling, large or small sample size) were tested. Support for most of the propositions is found, suggesting that research confirming prior beliefs tends to be rated higher and used whereas research contrary to prior beliefs tends to be evaluated as poor and is less likely to be used.

Heuristics and Biases in the Intuitive Projection of Retail Sales, ANTHONY D. COX and JOHN D. SUMMERS, August, 290–297.

See "Forecasting"

Individual Differences and Marketing Decision Support System Usage and Satisfaction, GEORGE M. ZINKHAN, ERICH A. JOACHIMSTHALER, and THOMAS C. KINNEAR, May, 208–214.

See "Marketing Decision Making"

Picture-Word Consistency and the Elaborative Processing of Advertisements, MICHAEL J. HOUSTON, TERRY L. CHILDERS, and SUSAN E. HECKLER, November, 359–369.

See "Advertising and Media Research"

Source Magnification: The Role of Multiple Sources in the Processing of Advertising Appeals, DAVID J. MOORE and RICHARD REARDON, November, 412–417.

See "Advertising and Media Research"

MARKETING DECISION MAKING

A Comparison of Factors Affecting Use of Marketing Information in Consumer and Industrial Firms, ROHIT DESHPANDE and GERALD ZALTMAN, February, 114–118.

See "Information Processing"

Evaluation and Use of Marketing Research by Decision Makers: A Behavioral Simulation, HANJOON LEE, FRANK ACITO, and RALPH L. DAY, May, 187–196.

See "Information Processing"

Individual Differences and Marketing Decision Support System Usage and Satisfaction, GEORGE M ZINKHAN, ERICH A. JOACHIMSTHALER, and THOMAS C. KINNEAR, May, 208–214.

Relatively little is known about how managers interact with marketing decision support systems such as a computer simulation. The authors investigate individual difference variables to determine their role in influencing the utilization of and satisfaction with one component of a marketing decision support system. The research vehicle used is a computer simulation model for assisting decision making in retailing. The findings indicate that risk averseness, involvement, cognitive differentiation, and age are important predictors of utilization and satisfaction. Managerial implications of the findings are discussed.

MEASUREMENT

Commentary on Howell's Observations, JOHN F. GASKI, February, 127–129.

See "Channels of Distribution"

Covariance Structure Modeling and Measurement Issues: A Note on "Interrelations Among a Channel Entity's Power Sources," ROY D. HOWELL, February, 119–126.

See "Channels of Distribution"

Generalizability Theory: A Comprehensive Method for Assessing and Improving the Dependability of Marketing Measures, JOSEPH O. RENTZ, February, 19–28.

The author proposes that generalizability theory be adopted by marketing researchers as a means of assessing and improving the dependability (reliability) of marketing measures. Concepts and

computational procedures are presented and the comprehensiveness and flexibility of generalizability analysis are illustrated. Classical reliability theory is shown to be inappropriate in many measurement situations in marketing.

Estimating Trait, Method, and Error Variance: Generalizing Across 70 Construct Validation Studies, JOSEPH A. COTE and M. RONALD BUCKLEY, August, 315–318.

See "Regression and Other Statistical Techniques"

Measurement of Discrimination Ability in Taste Tests: An Empirical Investigation, BRUCE BUCHANAN, MOSHE GIVON, and ARIEH GOLDMAN, May, 154–165.

For purposes of product testing, several tasks have been used to measure subjects' discrimination ability (i.e., their ability to distinguish between two slightly different product formulations). Three of the more common tasks are repeat paired comparisons, triangle tests, and preference rankings. In this empirical study, the properties of these three tasks are compared. The repeat paired comparison test is found to be the most sensitive discrimination task, in that subjects demonstrate the greatest ability in distinguishing between formulations, and preference ranking is the least sensitive. The finding that discrimination ability measured by triangle tests is significantly correlated with that measured by paired comparisons lends support to the validity of consistent preference discrimination testing.

On the Assessment of Unidimensional Measurement: Internal and External Consistency, and Overall Consistency Criteria, JAMES C. ANDERSON, DAVID W. GERBING, and JOHN E. HUNTER, November, 432–437.

Kumar and Dillon recently presented a conceptual, overall consistency criterion that represents a sufficient condition for consistency. In commenting on their article, the authors (1) clarify the interrelated nature of internal consistency and external consistency, (2) show that the "bogus perfect fit" example is itself "bogus" in that it cannot occur in either theory or practice, (3) underscore that the specific overall consistency criterion formula defined by Kumar and Dillon cannot be applied in practice, whereas the internal consistency and external consistency criteria can, and (4) caution against using within-block factor analyses as recommended by Kumar and Dillon, and instead advocate the use of confirmatory factor analysis with multiple-indicator measurement models for assessing unidimensionality. In an addendum, the authors discuss their position on unidimensionality and its assessment, contrasting it with the Kumar and Dillon position on unidimensionality and consistency.

Some Further Remarks on Measurement-Structure Interaction and the Unidimensionality of Constructs, AJITH KUMAR and WILLIAM R. DILLON, November, 438–444.

The authors address the criticisms raised by Anderson, Gerbing, and Hunter. In this context they consider several conceptual issues involved in using covariance structure analysis.

The Interaction of Measurement and Structure in Simultaneous Equation Models with Unobservable Variables, AJITH KUMAR and WILLIAM R. DILLON, February, 98–105.

The authors report the results of some theoretical investigations of interactions that occur in the simultaneous estimation of parameters. Under the assumptions of a perfectly specified model for a set of non-overlapping indicators and no sampling fluctuations, an overall consistency criterion is developed showing that though measurement and structure can be evaluated independently of each other, in general, they should not be. The proposed consistency criterion clearly shows that the internal and external consistency criteria prescribed by Anderson and Gerbing are not sufficient; that is, there are correlation matrices for which the criteria of internal and external consistency both can be satisfied, yet the matrix as a whole is inconsistent. Implications of the interaction between measurement and structure are also discussed.

The Sensitivity of Confirmatory Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis to Violations of Measurement Scale and Distributional Assumptions, EMIN BABAKUS, CARL E. FERGUSON, JR., and KARL G. JÖRESKOG, May, 222–228.

A large-scale simulation design was used to study the sensitivity of maximum likelihood (ML) factor analysis to violations of measurement scale and distributional assumptions in the input data. Product-moment, polychoric, Spearman's rho, and Kendall's tau-*b* correlations computed from ordinal data were used to estimate a single-factor model. The resulting ML estimates were compared on the bases of convergence rates and improper solutions, accuracy of the loading estimates, fit statistics, and estimated standard errors. The LISREL maximum likelihood solution algorithm was used to estimate model parameters. The polychoric correlation procedure was found to provide the most accurate estimates of pairwise correlations and factor loadings but performed worst on all goodness-of-fit criteria. LISREL overestimated all standard errors, thus not reflecting the effects of standardization as previously assumed. When the data were categorized, the polychoric correlations led to the best estimates of the standard errors.

NEW PRODUCT RESEARCH

A Stochastic First Purchase Diffusion Model: A Counting Process Approach, FRED BÖKER, February, 64–73.

The diffusion rate of a first purchase diffusion model is interpreted as the intensity function of a counting process. Parameter estimation procedures are considered and some generalizations of the basic model are discussed.

Estimating Willingness to Pay from Survey Data: An Alternative Pre-Test-Market Evaluation Procedure, TRUDY ANN CAMERON and MICHELLE D. JAMES, November, 389–395.

Closed-ended contingent valuation surveys are used to assess demands in hypothetical markets and recently have been applied widely to the valuation of (nonmarket) environmental resources. This interviewing strategy holds considerable promise for more general market research applications. The authors describe a new maximum likelihood estimation technique for use with these special data. Unlike previously used methods, the estimated models are as easy to interpret as ordinary least squares regression results and the results can be approximated accurately by packaged probit estimation routines.

REGRESSION AND OTHER STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

A Correction for Biasing Effects of Pilot Sample Size on Sample Size Determination, RONALD E. SHIFFLER and ARTHUR J. ADAMS, August, 319–321.

See "Sampling and Survey Methods"

Analyzing Marketing Research Data with Incomplete Information on the Dependent Variable, NARESH K. MALHOTRA, February, 74–84.

The author presents the general EM algorithm for analyzing incomplete data. As a specific application of the EM algorithm, a model is proposed for analyzing incomplete data in an important class of problems in marketing research. A simple estimation procedure also is developed. The model is investigated through Monté Carlo studies as well as empirically with encouraging results. Some of the advantages and limitations of the approach are discussed.

Comparing Interpoint Distances in Correspondence Analysis: A Clarification, J. DOUGLAS CARROLL, PAUL E. GREEN, and CATHERINE M. SCHAFFER, November, 445–450.
See "Scaling Methods"

Constrained Discrimination Via MDI Estimation: The Use of Additional Information in Segmentation Analysis, AJITH KUMAR and WILLIAM R. DILLON, November, 396–403.
See "Segmentation Research"

Cross-Validation for Prediction, BRUCE COOIL, RUSSELL S. WINER, and DAVID L. RADOS, August, 271–279.

The authors review and critically evaluate three major approaches to cross-validation in the context of predictive validity: (1) sample-splitting, (2) resampling plans such as bootstrapping, and (3) a method that simultaneously estimates parameters and cross-validates. Because of the information loss involved and the availability of shrinkage formulas, they argue that data-splitting is inferior to the simultaneous approach. An empirical example illustrates how the simultaneous approach can be used in conjunction with bootstrap resampling to construct prediction intervals that are superior to classical prediction intervals.

Estimating Brand Positioning Maps Using Supermarket Scanning Data, STEVEN M. SHUGAN, February, 1–18.
See "Brand Choice"

Estimating Trait, Method, and Error Variance: Generalizing Across 70 Construct Validation Studies, JOSEPH A. COTE and M. RONALD BUCKLEY, August, 315–318.

The authors examine the construct validation results of 70 published data sets. The analysis shows that, on average, traits account for less than 50% of the variance in construct measures. These findings raise questions about the application of statistical techniques that assume minimal measurement error or do not properly model systematic measurement error.

Estimating Willingness to Pay from Survey Data: An Alternative Pre-Test-Market Evaluation Procedure, TRUDY ANN CAMERON and MICHELLE D. JAMES, November, 389–395.
See "New Product Research"

Estimation and Use of Standard Errors of Latent Class Model Parameters, RAJIV GROVER, August, 298–304.

Only recently have latent class models been used effectively to analyze marketing data, though they have been popular for more than a decade in the social sciences. Most research reported in the literature does not include the standard errors of the estimates of the latent class model parameters. The author argues for the usefulness of standard errors while exploring for parsimonious models. He provides an approach to estimating standard errors of all parameters as estimated by the iterative proportional fitting algorithm of Goodman implemented in MLLSA.

Latent Class Models for the Analysis of Behavioral Hierarchies, LAWRENCE F. FEICK, May, 174–186.
See "Scaling Methods"

Validity and Structural Reliability of Multidimensional Scaling, NARESH K. MALHOTRA, May, 164–173.
See "Scaling Methods"

RESEARCH DESIGN

Measurement of Discrimination Ability in Taste Tests: An Empirical Investigation, BRUCE BUCHANAN, MOSHE GIVON, and ARIEH GOLDMAN, May, 154–165.
See "Measurement"

SALESFORCE RESEARCH

Modeling Marketing Interactions with Application to Salesforce Effectiveness, HUBERT GATIGNON and DOMINIQUE M. HANSSENS, August, 247–257
See "Econometric Models"

Territory Sales Response Models: Stability Over Time, ADRIAN B. RYANS and CHARLES B. WEINBERG, May, 229–233.

Empirical tests of territory sales response models have involved primarily a cross-sectional analysis of a salesforce at one point in time. Because such models often influence subsequent management decisions, the assumption that such models are stable over time is an important one. The authors consider factors that could influence the stability of such a model and use a five-year data base to explore the stability of a previously reported model of territory sales response. In this data base all the parameters appear to be stable over time.

SAMPLING AND SURVEY METHODS

A Correction for Biasing Effects of Pilot Sample Size on Sample Size Determination, RONALD E. SHIFFLER and ARTHUR J. ADAMS, August, 319–321.

When a pilot study variance is used to estimate σ^2 in the sample size formula, the resulting $\hat{n}$ is a random variable. The authors investigate the theoretical behavior of $\hat{n}$. Though $\hat{n}$ is more likely to underachieve than overachieve the unbiased n, correction factors to balance the bias are provided.

"Don't Know" Item Nonresponse in a Telephone Survey: Effects of Question Form and Respondent Characteristics, JAMES H. LEIGH and CLAUDE R. MARTIN, JR., November, 418–424.

Effects of question form, question content, and respondent experience/involvement factors on indicators of "don't know" item nonresponse to attitude questions were investigated in a split-ballot experiment with 398 respondents. Results provide support for premises of the threshold model formulated by Schuman and Presser. Experienced/involved respondents and those with little experience/involvement are found to differ in the degree of which item nonresponse varies with the number of scale points and question specificity. Implications and research directions are provided.

Generalizability Theory: A Comprehensive Method for Assessing and Improving the Dependability of Marketing Measures, JOSEPH O. RENTZ, February, 19–28.
See "Measurement"

SCALING METHODS

Comparing Interpoint Distances in Correspondence Analysis: A Clarification, J. DOUGLAS CARROLL, PAUL E. GREEN, and CATHERINE M. SCHAFFER, November, 445–450.

In a recent *JMR* article, the authors described and illustrated a correspondence analysis scaling that permitted both within-set and between-set squared distance comparisons. This note clarifies the relationship between the proposed scaling and another scaling (popular among the "French school" of data analysts) in which the diagonal matrix of singular values is applied to *both* **X** and **Y** coordinates. Using a data set from Greenacre, the authors examine conceptual and empirical contrasts among three alternative scalings.

Constructing MDS Joint Spaces from Binary Choice Data: A Multidimensional Unfolding Threshold Model for Marketing Research, WAYNE S. DeSARBO and DONNA L. HOFFMAN, February, 40–54.
See "Econometric Models"

Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE, TERENCE A. SHIMP and SUBHASH SHARMA, August, 280–289.
See "Buyer Behavior"

Latent Class Models for the Analysis of Behavioral Hierarchies, LAWRENCE F. FEICK, May, 174–186.
The author develops and describes latent class models useful for the analysis of behavioral hierarchies. The latent class models investigated are generalizations of the Guttman scale model and consider probabilistic relationships of item response to scale type and multiple hierarchical orderings of item responses. In addition, the author develops models for hierarchies that are present at the level of sets of items rather than at the level of individual items. He calls them "characteristics models" and examines their relationship to models for hierarchies of items. The models are illustrated on consumer complaint data gathered from a cross-sectional survey.

The Sensitivity of Confirmatory Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis to Violations of Measurement Scale and Distributional Assumptions, EMIN BABAKUS, CARL E. FERGUSON, JR., and KARL G. JÖRESKOG, May, 222–228.
See "Measurement"

Validity and Structural Reliability of Multidimensional Scaling, NARESH K. MALHOTRA, May, 164–173.
The author examines the convergent and discriminant validity of multidimensional scaling (MDS) using the multitrait-multimethod matrix approach. An assessment also is made of the impact on MDS solutions due to embedding of stimuli in similar stimuli and due to change in stimulus domain introduced via different kinds of stimuli. The results indicate reasonable validity and that MDS solutions are fairly robust to the impact of embedding but less robust to changes in stimulus domain.

SEGMENTATION RESEARCH

A Simultaneous Approach to Market Segmentation and Market Structuring, RAJIV GROVER and V. SRINIVASAN, May, 139–153.
The authors define a market segment to be a group of consumers homogeneous in terms of the probabilities of choosing the different brands in a product class. Because the vector of choice probabilities is homogeneous within segments and heterogeneous across segments, each segment is characterized by its corresponding group of brands with "large" choice probabilities. The competitive market structure is determined as the possibly overlapping groups of brands corresponding to the different segments. The use of brand choice probabilities as the basis for segmentation leads to market structuring and market segmentation becoming reverse sides of the same analysis. Using panel data, the authors obtain the matrix of cross-classification of brands chosen on two purchase occasions and extract segments by using the maximum likelihood method for estimating latent class models. An application to the instant coffee market indicates that the proposed approach has substantial validity and suggests the presence of submarkets related to product attributes as well as to brand names.

Constrained Discrimination Via MDI Estimation: The Use of Additional Information in Segmentation Analysis, AJITH KUMAR and WILLIAM R. DILLON, November, 396–403.
The authors demonstrate a general, flexible constrained discrimination method for testing hypotheses about the segmentability of a target population using categorical descriptors when additional information is available. The method applies the principle of minimum discrimination information (MDI) to the estimation of multinomial probabilities under linear equality and inequality constraints.

Empirical Evidence Supporting the Use of Multiple Choice Models in Analyzing a Population, DENNIS H. GENSCH, May, 197–207.
Standard practice in the application of disaggregate choice models is to assume all members of a (sample) population use the same basic decision process, and thus to employ one disaggregate choice model to analyze an entire population. The author suggests that not all decision makers use the same basic decision process on a given choice and that there are variables by which a sample can be partitioned *a priori* into segments assumed to be using different choice processes. The use of multiple disaggregate choice models, each model fitting the choice process assumptions of a segment, should improve both the predictive accuracy and the quality of the diagnostic information provided. Empirical information from two separate data sets tends to support strongly the approach of using multiple disaggregate choice models on a given (sample) population.

SERVICES MARKETING

Effects of Relationship Marketing on Satisfaction, Retention, and Prices in the Life Insurance Industry, LAWRENCE A. CROSBY and NANCY STEPHENS, November, 404–411.
see "Buyer Behavior"

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

Associative Positioning Strategies Through Comparative Advertising: Attribute Versus Overall Similarity Approaches, CORNELIA DRÖGE and RENÉ Y. DARMON, November, 377–388.
See "Advertising and Media Research"

Defensive Marketing Strategy by Customer Complaint Management: A Theoretical Perspective, CLAES FORNELL and BIRGER WERNERFELT, November, 337–346.
On the basis of Hirschman's exit-voice theory, an economic model of defensive marketing strategy is developed for complaint management. Though many firms strive to reduce the number of customer complaints about their products, this objective is found to be questionable. Instead, analysis suggests complaints from dissatisfied customers should be maximized subject to certain cost restrictions. The authors also show that defensive marketing (e.g., complaint management) can lower the total marketing expenditure by substantially reducing the cost of offensive marketing (e.g., advertising). The savings in offensive marketing are often high enough to offset the additional costs associated with compensating complaining customers, even if compensation exceeds the product's profit margin.

AUTHOR/TITLE INDEX*

ACHABAL, DALE D., *Site Evaluation and Location System*, by Douglas O. Love and Jerome A. Deichert, August, 329–330, r.

ACITO, FRANK, see LEE.

ADAMS, ARTHUR J., see SHIFFLER.

ADOLPHSON, DONALD and SCOTT M. SMITH, *What's Best!; SUPER STATGRAPH; MULTIFIT*, November, 459–461, r.

ANAND, PUNAM, Inducing Franchisees to Relinquish Control: An Attribution Analysis, May, 215.

*r indicates book or software review.

ANDERSON, ERIN, LEONARD M. LODISH, and BARTON A. WEITZ, Resource Allocation Behavior in Conventional Channels, February, 85–97.
ANDERSON, JAMES C., DAVID W. GERBING, and JOHN E. HUNTER, On the Assessment of Unidimensional Measurement: Internal and External Consistency, and Overall Consistency Criteria, November, 432–437.
ARNOLD, STEPHEN J., TAE H. OUM, BOHUMIR PAZDERKA, and DOUGLAS W. SNETSINGER, Advertising Quality in Sales Response Models, February, 106–113.
ASSAEL, HENRY, see KAMINS.

BABAKUS, EMIN, CARL E. FERGUSON, JR., and KARL G. JÖRESKOG, The Sensitivity of Confirmatory Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis to Violations of Measurement Scale and Distributional Assumptions, May, 222.
BAKER, KENNETH G. and ROBERT D. ROGERS, Review and Comparison of Nine Statistical Software Packages for the Apple Macintosh PC, May, 241–244, r.
BAWA, KAPIL and ROBERT W. SHOEMAKER, The Effects of a Direct Mail Coupon on Brand Choice Behavior, November, 370–376.
BEATTY, SHARON E., *Qualitative Methods of Research: A Matter of Interpretation*, European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research, August, 322–323, r.
BELTRAMINI, RICHARD F., *Meta-Analysis: Quantitative Methods for Research Synthesis*, by Frederic M. Wolf, November, 452–453, r.
BLOCH, PETER H., Five Statistical Packages for IBM PCs: Power, But Hard Disk Not Required, August, 330–334, r.
BÖKER, FRED, A Stochastic First Purchase Diffusion Model: A Counting Process Approach, February, 64–73.
BROWNE, BEVERLY A., see BROWNE, WILLIAM G.
BROWNE, WILLIAM G. and BEVERLY A. BROWNE, *Multiple Comparisons*, by Alan J. Klockars and Gilbert Sax, November, 455–456, r.
BUCHANAN, BRUCE, MOSHE GIVON, and ARIEH GOLDMAN, Measurement of Discrimination Ability in Taste Tests: An Empirical Investigation, May, 154.
BUCKLEY, M. RONALD, see COTE.
BUSCH, PAUL S., see SZYMANSKI.

CADOTTE, ERNEST R., ROBERT B. WOODRUFF, and ROGER L. JENKINS, Expectations and Norms in Models of Consumer Satisfaction, August, 305–314.
CAMERON, TRUDY A. and MICHELLE D. JAMES, Estimating Willingness to Pay from Survey Data: An Alternative Pre-Test-Market Evaluation Procedure, November, 389–395.
CARMONE, FRANK, *ABtab Pro Release 3.03*, May, 244–246, r.
———, *ACA System for Adaptive Conjoint Analysis*, August, 325–327, r.
CARROLL, J. DOUGLAS, PAUL E. GREEN, and CATHERINE M. SCHAFFER, Comparing Interpoint Distances in Correspondence Analysis: A Clarification, November, 445–450.
CHILDERS, TERRY L., see HOUSTON.
CHRISTENSEN, RODNEY E., *Information Behavior: A Multidisciplinary List of References*, by Mairéad Browne, August, 325, r.
COHEN, WILLIAM A., *Honomichl on Marketing Research*, by Jack M. Honomichl, November, 453–454, r.
COLE, CATHERINE A. and MICHAEL J. HOUSTON, Encoding and Media Effects on Consumer Learning Deficiencies in the Elderly, February, 55–63.
COOIL, BRUCE, RUSSELL S. WINER, and DAVID L. RADOS, Cross-Validation for Prediction, August, 271–279.
COTE, JOSEPH A. and M. RONALD BUCKLEY, Estimating Trait, Method, and Error Variance: Generalizing Across 70 Construct Validation Studies, August, 315–318.
COX, ANTHONY D. and JOHN D. SUMMERS, Heuristics and Biases in the Intuitive Projection of Retail Sales, August, 290–297.
COX, ELI P., III, *A Research Primer for the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, by Miriam Schapiro Grosof and Hyman Sardy; *Social and Behavioral Science Research: A New Framework for Conceptualizing, Implementing, and Evaluating Research Studies*, by David R. Krathwohl, February, 131–132, r.
CROSBY, LAWRENCE A. and NANCY STEPHENS, Effects of Relationship Marketing on Satisfaction, Retention, and Prices in the Life Insurance Industry, November, 404–411.

DARMON, RENÉ Y., see DRÖGE.
DAY, RALPH L., see LEE.
DeSARBO, WAYNE S. and DONNA L. HOFFMAN, Constructing MDS Joint Spaces from Binary Choice Data: A Multidimensional Unfolding Threshold Model for Marketing Research, February, 40–54.
DESHPANDE, ROHIT and GERALD ZALTMAN, A Comparison of Factors Affecting Use of Marketing Information in Consumer and Industrial Firms, February, 114–118.
DILLON, WILLIAM R., see KUMAR.
DRÖGE, CORNELIA and RENÉ Y. DARMON, Associative Positioning Strategies Through Comparative Advertising: Attribute Versus Overall Similarity Approaches, November, 377–388.
DWYER, F. ROBERT and SEJO OH, Output Sector Munificence Effects on the Internal Political Economy of Marketing Channels, November, 347–358.

FEICK, LAWRENCE F., Latent Class Models for the Analysis of Behavioral Hierarchies, May, 174.
FERGUSON, CARL E., JR., see BABAKUS.
FORNELL, CLAES and BIRGER WERNERFELT, Defensive Marketing Strategy by Customer Complaint Management: A Theoretical Analysis, November, 337–346.
FOX, KAREN F. A., *Family Research Methods*, by Brent C. Miller, August, 324–325, r.

GASKI, JOHN F., Commentary on Howell's Observations, February, 127–129.
GATIGNON, HUBERT and DOMINIQUE M. HANSSENS, Modeling Marketing Interactions with Application to Salesforce Effectiveness, August, 247–257.
GENSCH, DENNIS H., Empirical Evidence Supporting the Use of Multiple Choice Models in Analyzing a Population, May, 197.
GERBING, DAVID W., see ANDERSON, JAMES C.
GILLPATRICK, THOMAS R., *Analysis of Experiments with Missing Data*, by Yadolah Dodge, February 130–131, r.
GIVON, MOSHE, see BUCHANAN.
GOLDMAN, ARIEH, see BUCHANAN.
GOODRICH, JONATHAN N., *Survey Design and Analysis*, by F. R. Jolliffe, February, 134, r.
GREEN, PAUL E., *CONJOINT ANALYZER*, August, 327–329, r.
———, see CARROLL.
GROVER, RAJIV, Estimation and Use of Standard Errors of Latent Class Model Parameters, August, 298–304.
——— and V. SRINIVASAN, A Simultaneous Approach to Market Segmentation and Market Structuring, May, 139.

HAMILTON, JANET G., *EASYCASTER; MICRO-TSP, 5.0*, February, 136–138, r.

HANSSENS, DOMINIQUE M., see GATIGNON.
HECKLER, SUSAN E., see HOUSTON.
HOFFMAN, DONNA L., see DeSARBO.
HOUSTON, MICHAEL J., see COLE.
———, TERRY L. CHILDERS, and SUSAN E. HECKLER, Picture-Word Consistency and the Elaborative Processing of Advertisements, November, 359–369.
HOWELL, ROY D., Covariance Structure Modeling and Measurement Issues: A Note on "Interrelations Among a Channel Entity's Power Sources," February, 119–126.
———, Covariance Structure Modeling on the Personal Computer, November, 456–459, r.
HUNTER, JOHN E., see ANDERSON, JAMES C.

JACOBS, LAURENCE, *Marketing Mix Analysis with Lotus 1-2-3*, by Gary Lilien, November, 454–455, r.
JACOBY, JACOB, *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*, by J. M. Converse and S. Presser, August, 322, r.
JAMES, MICHELLE D., see CAMERON.
JENKINS, ROGER L., see CADOTTE.
JOACHIMSTHALER, ERICH A., see ZINKHAN.
JÖRESKOG, KARL G., see BABAKUS.

KAMINS, MICHAEL A. and HENRY ASSAEL, Two-Sided Versus One-Sided Appeals: A Cognitive Perspective on Argumentation, Source Derogation, and the Effect of Disconfirming Trial on Belief Change, February, 29–39.
KINNEAR, THOMAS C., see ZINKHAN.
KUMAR, AJITH and WILLIAM R. DILLON, Constrained Discrimination Via MDI Estimation: The Use of Additional Information in Segmentation Analysis, November, 396–403.
——— and ———, Some Further Remarks on Measurement-Structure Interaction and the Unidimensionality of Constructs, November, 438–444.
——— and ———, The Interaction of Measurement and Structure in Simultaneous Equation Models with Unobservable Variables, February, 98–105.

LEE, HANJOON, FRANK ACITO, and RALPH L. DAY, Evaluation and Use of Marketing Research by Decision Makers: A Behavioral Simulation, May, 187.
LEIGH, JAMES H. and CLAUDE R. MARTIN, JR., "Don't Know" Item Nonresponse in a Telephone Survey: Effects of Question Form and Respondent Characteristics, November, 418–424.
LODISH, LEONARD M., see ANDERSON, ERIN.

MacLACHLAN, DOUGLAS L., *The Logic of Causal Order*, by James A. Davis, August, 323–324, r.
MALHOTRA, NARESH K., Analyzing Marketing Research Data with Incomplete Information on the Dependent Variable, February, 74–84.
———, Validity and Structural Reliability of Multidimensional Scaling, May, 164.
MARTIN, CLAUDE R., JR., see LEIGH.
MOORE, DAVID J. and RICHARD REARDON, Source Magnification: The Role of Multiple Sources in the Processing of Advertising Appeals, November, 412–417.
MORIARTY, MARK M., *Robust Statistics*, by Frank R. Hampel, Peter J. Rousseeuw, Elvezio M. Ronchetti, and Werner A. Stahel, May, 238–239, r.
MUNCY, JAMES A., *Psychophysiology: Systems, Processes, and Applications*, by Michael G. H. Coles, Emanuel Donchin, and Stephen W. Porges, editors, May, 234–235, r.

NELSON, JAMES E., *YMC: Your Marketing Consultant; SOURCE Products, Version 2*, May, 239–241, r.

OBERMILLER, CARL, *The Role of Affect in Consumer Behavior: Emerging Theories and Applications*, by Robert A. Peterson, Wayne D. Hoyer, and William R. Wilson, February, 134–136, r.
OH, SEJO, see DWYER.
OUM, TAE H., see ARNOLD.

PAZDERKA, BOHUMIR, see ARNOLD.

RADOS, DAVID L., see COOIL.
REARDON, RICHARD, see MOORE.
REINGEN, PETER H., *The Physical Attractiveness Phenomena*, by Gordon L. Patzer, February, 133–134, r.
RENTZ, JOSEPH O., Generalizability Theory: A Comprehensive Method for Assessing and Improving the Dependability of Marketing Measures, February, 19–28.
RICHARDS, LARRY E., *Multivariate Analysis of Variance*, by James H. Bray and Scott E. Maxwell, May, 239, r.
ROGERS, ROBERT D., see BAKER.
RYANS, ADRIAN B. and CHARLES B. WEINBERG, Territory Sales Response Models: Stability Over Time, May, 229.

SAWYER, ALAN G., *Meta-Analysis in Marketing: Generalization of Response Models*, by John U. Farley and Donald R. Lehmann, November, 451–452, r.
SCHAFFER, CATHERINE M., see CARROLL.
SHARMA, SUBHASH, see SHIMP.
SHIFFLER, RONALD E. and ARTHUR J. ADAMS, A Correction for Biasing Effects of Pilot Sample Size on Sample Size Determination, August, 319–321.
SHIMP, TERENCE A. and SUBHASH SHARMA, Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE, August, 280–289.
SHOEMAKER, ROBERT W., see BAWA.
SHUGAN, STEVEN M., Estimating Brand Positioning Maps Using Supermarket Scanning Data, February, 1–18.
SMITH, SCOTT M., see ADOLPHSON.
SNETSINGER, DOUGLAS W., see ARNOLD.
SRINIVASAN, V., see GROVER.
SRIVASTAVA, RAJENDRA, *The Elements of Graphing Data*, by William S. Cleveland, November, 461–462, r.
STEPHENS, NANCY, see CROSBY.
SUMMERS, JOHN D., see COX, ANTHONY D.
SZYMANSKI, DAVID M. and PAUL S. BUSCH, Identifying the Generics-Prone Consumer: A Meta-Analysis, November, 425–431.

UMESH, U. N., *Randomized Response: A Method for Sensitive Surveys*, by James Alan Fox and Paul E. Tracy, May, 236–238, r.

WEINBERG, CHARLES B., see RYANS.
WEITZ, BARTON A., see ANDERSON, ERIN.
WERNERFELT, BIRGER, see FORNELL.
WESTBROOK, ROBERT A., Product/Consumption-Based Affective Responses and Postpurchase Processes, August, 258–270.
WILEY, JAMES B., *Mathematical Models of Attitude Change: Change in Single Attitudes and Cognitive Structure*, Volume One, by John E. Hunter, Jeffery E. Danes, and Stanley H. Cohen, May, 235–236, r.
WINER, RUSSELL S., see COOIL.
WOODRUFF, ROBERT B., see CADOTTE.

ZALTMAN, GERALD, see DESHPANDE.
ZINKHAN, GEORGE M., ERICH A. JOACHIMSTHALER, and THOMAS C. KINNEAR, Individual Differences and Marketing Decision Support System Usage and Satisfaction, May, 208.

BOOKS AND SOFTWARE REVIEWED

Books

BRAY, JAMES H. and SCOTT E. MAXWELL, Multivariate Analysis of Variance, Larry E. Richards, May, 239.
BROWNE, MAIRÉAD, Information Behavior: A Multidisciplinary List of References, Rodney E. Christensen, August, 325.
CLEVELAND, WILLIAM S., The Elements of Graphing Data, Rajendra Srivastava, November, 461–462.
COHEN, STANLEY H., see HUNTER.
COLES, MICHAEL G. H., EMANUEL DONCHIN, and STEPHEN W. PORGES, editors, Psychophysiology: Systems, Processes, and Applications, James A. Muncy, May, 234.
CONVERSE, J. M. and S. PRESSER, Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire, Jacob Jacoby, August, 322.
DANES, JEFFERY E., see HUNTER.
DAVIS, JAMES A., The Logic of Causal Order, Douglas L. MacLachlan, August, 323.
DODGE, YADOLAH, Analysis of Experiments with Missing Data, Thomas R. Gillpatrick, February, 130.
DONCHIN, EMANUEL, see COLES.
EUROPEAN SOCIETY FOR OPINION AND MARKETING RESEARCH, Qualitative Methods of Research: A Matter of Interpretation, Sharon E. Beatty, August, 322.
FARLEY, JOHN U. and DONALD R. LEHMANN, Meta-Analysis in Marketing: Generalization of Response Models, Alan G. Sawyer, November, 451–452.
FOX, JAMES ALAN, and PAUL E. TRACY, Randomized Response: A Method for Sensitive Surveys, U. N. Umesh, May, 236.
GROSOF, MIRIAM SCHAPIRO and HYMAN SARDY, A Research Primer for the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Eli P. Cox, III, February, 131.
HAMPEL, FRANK R., PETER J. ROUSSEEUW, ELVEZIO M. RONCHETTI, and WERNER A. STAHEL, Robust Statistics, Mark M. Moriarty, May, 238.
HONOMICHL, JACK M., Honomichl on Marketing Research, William A. Cohen, November, 453–454.
HOYER, WAYNE D., see PETERSON.
HUNTER, JOHN E., JEFFERY E. DANES, and STANLEY H. COHEN, Mathematical Models of Attitude Change: Change in Single Attitudes and Cognitive Structure, Volume One, James B. Wiley, May, 235.
JOLLIFFE, F. R., Survey Design and Analysis, Jonathan N. Goodrich, February, 134.
KLOCKARS, ALAN J. and GILBERT SAX, Multiple Comparisons, William G. Browne and Beverly A. Browne, November, 455–466.
KRATHWOHL, DAVID R., Social and Behavioral Science Research: A New Framework for Conceptualizing, Implementing, and Evaluating Research Studies, Eli P. Cox, III, February, 131.
LEHMANN, DONALD R., see FARLEY.
LILIEN, GARY, Marketing Mix Analysis with Lotus 1-2-3, Laurence Jacobs, November, 454–455.
MAXWELL, SCOTT E., see BRAY.
MILLER, BRENT C., Family Research Methods, Karen F. A. Fox, August, 324.
PATZER, GORDON L., The Physical Attractiveness Phenomena, Peter H. Reingen, February, 133.
PETERSON, ROBERT A., WAYNE D. HOYER, and WILLIAM R. WILSON, The Role of Affect in Consumer Behavior: Emerging Theories and Applications, Carl Obermiller, February, 134.
PORGES, STEPHEN W., see COLES.
PRESSER, S., see CONVERSE.
RONCHETTI, ELVEZIO M., see HAMPEL.
ROUSSEEUW, PETER J., see HAMPEL.
SARDY, HYMAN, see GROSOF.
SAX, GILBERT, see KLOCKARS.
STAHEL, WERNER A., see HAMPEL.
TRACY, PAUL E., see FOX.
WILSON, WILLIAM R., see PETERSON.
WOLF, FREDERIC, Meta-Analysis: Quantitative Methods for Research Synthesis, Richard F. Beltramini, November, 452–453.

Software

ABtab Pro Release 3.03, Frank Carmone, May, 244.
ACA System for Adaptive Conjoint Analysis, Frank Carmone, August, 325.
BENTLER, PETER M., EQS/PC, Roy D. Howell, November, 456–459.
CONJOINT ANALYZER, Paul E. Green, August, 327.
DEICHERT, JEROME A., see LOVE.
EASYCASTER, Janet G. Hamilton, February, 136.
JÖRESKOG, KARL G. and DAG SÖRBOM, LISREL-PC and PRELIS, Roy D. Howell, November, 456–459.
LOVE, DOUGLAS O. and JEROME A. DEICHERT, Site Evaluation and Location System, Dale A. Achabal, August, 329.
MacFits 1.1, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
Mac·Stat·Pak 1.3, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
MICRO-TSP, 5.0, Janet G. Hamilton, February, 136.
MULTIFIT, Donald L. Adolphson and Scott M. Smith, November, 459–461.
NWA StatPak 3.15, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
SÖRBOM, DAG, see JÖRESKOG.
SOURCE Products, Version 2, James E. Nelson, May, 239.
Stat-80 Professional Version 2.10, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
STATA 1.4, Peter H. Bloch, August, 330.
StatFast-2,2.0, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
STATGRAPHICS, Peter H. Bloch, August, 330.
STATPRO 2.0, Peter H. Bloch, August, 330.
Stats Tool Kit 1.51, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
StatView 1.0, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
StatView 512+, 1.1, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
SUPER STATGRAPH, Donald L. Adolphson and Scott M. Smith, November, 459–461.
SYSTAT 3.0, Kenneth G. Baker and Robert D. Rogers, May, 241.
SYSTAT 3.0, Peter H. Bloch, August, 330.
What's Best!, Donald L. Adolphson and Scott M. Smith, November, 459–461.
YMC: Your Marketing Consultant, James E. Nelson, May, 239.
Y-STAT, Peter H. Bloch, August, 330.